

UC-NRLF



B 3 148 455

LIBRARY
OF THE
UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA.
GIFT OF

Fred. N. Scott

Received Oct. 31 , 1892.

Accessions No. 49085 Shelf No.

9-30m 4, '70 (N5878)





Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2008 with funding from
Microsoft Corporation



51 1892

ÆSTHETICS

ITS PROBLEMS AND LITERATURE

BY

FRED N. SCOTT, PH. D.

Assistant-Professor of Rhetoric in the University of Michigan



ANN ARBOR

The Inland Press

1890

49085

THE REGISTER PUBLISHING COMPANY:
ANN ARBOR, MICHIGAN.

INTRODUCTORY.

IT must be regarded as unfortunate that the study of works of art and the study of the theory of art have somehow come to be looked upon as two altogether distinct lines of research, for each of these two important branches of knowledge, when rightly considered, is seen to be essential to the well-being of the other. *Æsthetics*, unless it rests on a concrete basis of actual art products, unless, even, it is prepared to reckon with the latest attenuation of 'realism' and the most recent discoveries in archæology, is in no small danger of becoming abstract or fantastic. And with not less reason it may be maintained that the study of art, when it rejects the help of sound constructive principles, either lapses into what may be called archæological book-keeping, or, worse still, passes over into mere sentimentality and windy suspiration. The breach between the two has been widened, perhaps, by the conven-

tional interpretations often laid upon that long-suffering term, art. To study art, in the popular rendering of the phrase, is to study painting and sculpture, sometimes, in addition, architecture. Too often, it means little more than learning the names and dates of famous sculptors and painters, together with a few facts about their works and formulæ for distinguishing the school to which each artist is assumed to belong. This is, of course, an interesting, and, on the whole, a profitable branch of study, one, at any rate, that will never lack for students — *μανθάνειν οὐ μόνον τοῖς φιλοσόφοις ἡδίστον ἀλλὰ καὶ τοῖς ἄλλοις* — but it is probably not one-half as interesting, and certainly not one tithe as profitable and stimulating as it would be if the two or three kinds of art, thus singled out and isolated, were understood in their true kinship to each other and to their sister arts. And if this be so, we may go still further and confidently assert that such study has infinitely to gain in real value and attractiveness by seeking for the relation of its subject-matter to human experience in general.

This is not, perhaps, the common view, but it is one that the present writer is prepared stoutly to defend. It would not be hard to show that

æsthetic theory of some sort, and of some degree, is required in all art study, even, for example, in the identification of a bronze toe from Mt. Ptous. The relations of art to nature, the true inwardness of realism and idealism, the stages of growth in art evolution—all these weighty problems might pirouette, not vainly, upon that single toe! As a matter of fact, such questions do arise at every turn in the most tentative or the most technical study of art, to be settled foolishly or wisely, according to the enlightenment of the student. Take one example: the so-called realistic novel. It is not too much to say that nine-tenths of all that has appeared in books and magazines of late, bearing upon this particular subject, has been simply so much beating of the air. Most of the discussions resemble the mock-serious encounters of the modern French duel, in which, notwithstanding the great show of activity *sur le terrain*, the fine display of bandages and surgical instruments, the much longing and parrying and riposteing, no one, except by pure accident, ever suffers the slightest injury. When, however, — but this happens only at long intervals—some trained thinker has deemed it worth his while to ply the rapier for a moment,

how different the outcome! * Then there has been bloodshed, and some swaggering fallacy has been left lying face downward on the sands. In plain words, one writer has understood what he is talking about, the other has not. One has had for his weapon of analysis a consistent æsthetic theory, the other only a few stock literary conventions.

Surely, then, on this one point, a clear knowledge of æsthetics does not come amiss. And, in general, if a little knowledge of æsthetics is a dangerous thing, does not the way of salvation lie in the direction of more æsthetics, not of less? If it is a good thing, for example, when one is studying Browning, to know a little about lyric poetry, is it not a better thing to know the relations of lyric to other types of literary expression? And if so, may it not be a further advantage to be able to carry the whole discussion back to the principles of artistic expression in general?

If it be true, then, that the connection between art and the theory of art is a thing to be desired, and if, as is probably the case, the study

* It would be perilous to cite examples here, but perhaps the article of Prof. T. H. Green, *An Estimate of the Value and Influence of Works of Fiction in Modern Times* (Works, Vol. 3), may be referred to without offense.

of particular works of art is in no danger of neglect, it may not be out of place to call attention more especially to the theoretical side of art-study, pointing out some of the more important problems of æsthetics, and indicating the sources in which the solution of them may be found.





PROBLEMS IN AESTHETICS.

THE following list of problems is intended to be suggestive merely. Each might be divided and subdivided *ad indefinitum*.

i. *Physiological.*

The general problem of physiological æsthetics may be stated in this way: What is the origin, nature, and physical explanation of the æsthetic thrill? As the inquiry usually proceeds upon the assumption that æsthetic feeling is a species of pleasurable feeling, the line of research is in the direction of differentiating this kind of sensuous pleasure from sensuous pleasure in general. Thus the following series of subsidiary problems arises:—

(1.) What changes in the nervous system, resulting from the application of stimuli, produce the sensation of pleasure?

(2.) (a) What classes of objects supply these stimuli? (b) What are the attributes of these objects? (c) Do dissimilar qualities furnish the same result, or is there some one quali-

ty, existing in different forms, in all objects that occasion pleasure?

(3.) Is the relation between the stimulus and the pleasurable feeling necessary and invariable, or accidental and mutable?

(4.) How are pleasurable feelings related to the vital functions?

(5.) (a) What quality in the stimulus, or (b) what modification of the neural process, occasions the æsthetic quality of the feeling?

(6.) What are the pre-eminently æsthetic senses?

Assuming that hearing and seeing are the only, or the pre-eminently, æsthetic senses, the physiologist may inquire:—

(7.) What in the nervous structure and function of the ear corresponds to the relations of tones constituting the musical scale? to the relations of tones constituting harmony or discord?

(8.) What are the exact mathematical relations of such tones?

(9.) What are the neural equivalents of rhythm and melody?

(10.) What colors and combinations of colors are pleasing to the eye?

(11.) What forms and proportions of objects are pleasing?

(12.) What movements of the eye and modifications of its neural processes correspond to pleasing forms and colors of objects?

ii. *Psychological.*

Æsthetics as psychology is most obviously concerned with the nature of æsthetic feeling, although it is bound to take into account all facts of consciousness involved in the production of such feeling. Calling, for convenience, all objects that can arouse æsthetic feeling *æsthetic objects*, the psychologist may inquire:—

(1.) Does the perception of the æsthetic object differ from that of other objects? And if so, how?

This problem resolves itself into two subordinate problems:—

(a) What sensations do the peculiar physical marks of the æsthetic object, as e. g., color, symmetry, etc., produce?

(b) How is this raw material of sensation worked up into consciousness through perception?

(2.) What is the nature and function of imagination in so far as it has to do with the æsthetic object?

(3.) Characteristics of the different kinds of æsthetic imagination?

(4.) Are all æsthetic objects (e. g., natural objects) products of the æsthetic imagination?

(5.) Can the æsthetic imagination do anything more than combine what has been given it in experience?

(6.) Why does the mind take an interest in the æsthetic object?

(7.) Characteristics of æsthetic feeling? How related to sensation?

(8.) Kinds of æsthetic feeling?

(9.) Relations between æsthetic feeling and other kinds of feeling?

(10.) Æsthetic function of the will?

iii. *Speculative.*

The problem of æsthetics as philosophy may be stated, in a general way, to be the relation of the subject-matter (whatever that may be determined to be) to human experience. As suggested by the parenthesis, the nature of the subject-matter is itself a part of the problem. Retaining the convenient term æsthetic object, we may inquire:—

(1.) What is it about things that makes them æsthetic objects?

This not very sensible question always elicits the equally wise answer, *Beauty*. If it is necessary to posit some particular thing as the essence of the æsthetic object, it would perhaps be better to substitute for the ambiguous term beauty the term *æsthetic value*, which has the advantage, at least, of suggesting its question-begging character.

(2.) Is æsthetic value subjective, or objective, or both?

(3.) Kinds of æsthetic value, and relation of one kind to another?

As examples of the different kinds may be mentioned, the Beautiful, the Sublime, the Ludicrous, the Pathetic, the Tragic, the Grotesque, etc.

(4.) Relation of the work of art to nature?

This question may take on a great diversity of forms, as, for example:—

(a) Is art an imitation of nature, and if so, is that all that art is?

(b) In what respect does the æsthetic value of art differ from that of nature?

(c) Is there a higher and a lower æsthetic value, and if so, which is higher, that of nature or that of art?

(d) Does nature, when it takes on æsthetic value, become art?

(5.) Character of the work of art?

In dealing with the work of art, we may regard it as complete in itself and inquire (a) What is its essential principle; or, taking into account the conditions of its production, may ask (b) Why works of art should be produced at all, or, (c) What were the aims and motives of the producer of a particular work; or, (d) By what processes and in obedience to what laws he gave embodiment to his idea; or, (e) In what material he embodied it; or, (f) What are the laws of the development of art in general? The answer to the first question will bring before us the theory of art; to the second, the genesis of art, or the art-impulse; to the third, the relations of art and the artist; to the fourth, the technique of art; to the fifth, the classification of the arts; and to the sixth, the evolution of art as a historical growth.

Finally, we may consider works of art as potent factors in social and moral development, demand to know whether their influence is moral or immoral, and inquire what ends of education or enlightenment, if any, are subserved by their existence.



LITERATURE OF AESTHETICS.*

THERE are two classes of students whose needs must be taken into account: first, those who wish to get merely general notions from trustworthy authorities without being put to the expense of time and trouble necessary to form an independent judgment; second, those who wish to go to the bottom of the matter. The two classes will of necessity pursue their studies in a somewhat different order and according to different methods.

I.

It will be of advantage for the student to learn, at the outset, the limits of the subject he is to study, the most important problems that are likely to arise, and the names, and at least a primitive notion of the views, of the recognized authorities. These facts may be gleaned from

*For a general bibliography of the subject, the student may be referred to *A Guide to the Literature of Æsthetics*, by C. M. Gayley and F. N. Scott (Berkeley: 1900. Univ. of Cal. Library Bulletins, No. 11). In what follows, the numbers in parentheses refer to pages of the 'Guide.' When the work is one not men-

the articles on 'Art,' 'Fine Art,' and 'Æsthetics,' in the 9th edition of the *Encyclopaedia Britannica*. Some acquaintance with the psychology of the subject may next be sought in Dewey's *Psychology* (42), chaps. 7 and 9, Sully's *Outlines* (43), p. 316-329, 531-552, and the article *Art and Psychology*, in *Mind*, 1:479. The opening chapter of Everett's *Poetry, Comedy, and Duty* (17) is an easy and delightful introduction to the psychology of the imagination. For the philosophical treatment of the subject the chapters in Everett's *Science of Thought* (17) on *Beauty and Æsthetics* are well adapted to the needs of beginners, while the lecture of Prof. G. S. Morris in *Jl. Spec. Philos.* 10:1, and Ker's *Essay on Art*, in *Seth and Haldane's Essays* (24), may be recommended as at once lucid and profound. Begg's *Development of Taste* (16) is excellent in spirit and, generally, in method. Kedney's *Exposition of Hegel* (27), in spite of numerous defects, is about the best handbook of æsthetics now in the market. Bosanquet's translation of *Hegel's Introduction*

tioned in the 'Guide,' the bibliographical data are given with sufficient fulness to identify it. A careful bibliography of about one hundred and forty titles, arranged according to date of publication, will be found in *Notes and Queries*, 6th. Ser., VIII. 183, 243, 302, 382.

(26) should be in the hands of every student.

The writings that fill an important place in the history of æsthetics can be properly understood, in most cases, only with reference to the philosophical systems of which they form component parts. A few, however, are of a semi-popular character. In Goethe's *Conversations* (25) almost all the main questions of art-theory are touched upon and rendered luminous. Schiller's *Æsthetic Letters* (31) are delightful reading, and thus easily carry the student along into philosophic depths that he would not otherwise venture to explore. The same is true of the æsthetic doctrines of Schopenhauer (32), one of the most readable and entertaining of modern writers on æsthetics, whose value, however, lies rather in his remarks by the way than in his main conclusions. Cousin's lectures on the True, the Beautiful, and the Good (36), which at one time enjoyed some popularity as a text book, are written in popular form, but cannot be recommended as an adequate presentation of æsthetic theory. Ruskin (20) should be read by everyone, but rather for his descriptions of art and nature than for his philosophy. Though a powerful stimulus to the sense for beauty, he is not the best propædæutic in the world to the science

of art. As a corrective, may be read Miss Paget's article on Ruskinism, in *Belcaro* (32), which, in seeking to rectify Ruskin's moral bias, goes almost too far in the opposite direction. A careful criticism of the third volume of *Modern Painters* will be found in an article by Prof. Everett in *No. Am.* 84: 379.

Though the number of those who write on æsthetics in a popular way is very great, only a few can be referred to here. Miss Paget (Vernon Lee) writes with a capricious self-assurance that makes her occasional essays charming literature. They are interesting, however, rather as recording the shifting moods of a sensitive personality in the presence of art, than as constituting careful and connected thinking about art. *Belcaro*, a collection of articles originally printed in the magazines, is full of fresh and striking observations upon sculpture, music, and poetry. *Juvenilia* (Lond: 1887) is of the same character. Miss Paget's most ambitious flight is an article on Comparative Æsthetics, in *Contemp.* 38: 300, a not altogether successful attempt to weld Hegel and Taine. The essay on the Value of the Ideal, in *Baldwin* (Lond: 1886), defines pretty clearly her philosophical position, in so far as she can be said to have one. Walter

Pater's delicacy of intuition leads him to safe conclusions even where his writings seem mere transcripts of impression. The introduction and conclusion of his *Studies in the History of the Renaissance* (23), and the essay on Wincklemann, in the same volume, are well worth reading. The fundamental principle of his æsthetic is perhaps most clearly set forth in his essay on *Style*, in *Appreciations* (Lond: 1889). The critical writings of J. A. Symonds are underlaid by a consistent and easily comprehensible theory of art which the author has once or twice set forth with some explicitness; for example, in the *Renaissance in Italy*, the *Catholic Reaction*, Pt. 2, p. 396-402 (113), and *Essays, Speculative and Suggestive* (Lond: 1890). Upon the last-named work, see the criticism in *Nation* 51:173. The younger Symonds should not be confused with J. A. Symonds, M. D., author of *Principles of Beauty* (Lond: 1857). Gurney's magazine articles have been collected in the *Power of Sound* (70) and *Tertium Quid* (2v. Lond: 1887). The third chapter of the *Power of Sound* is an exposition of the author's æsthetics. Sully is hardly to be mentioned in the category of the merely popular, though the clearness and simplicity of his treatment of difficult matters



adapt his writings to the needs of the beginner. His *Sensation and Intuition* (22) presents the scientific aspect of many important questions. Prof. Seeley's article on *Elementary Principles in Art*, *Macm* 16: 1, is a good introduction to the subject.

Inquiries are often made by students for some popular compend which shall embrace within its covers all the information about art that they need to acquire. It is hardly necessary to say that all hopes of this character are indulged in vain; no such book exists. Nevertheless, as popular compends have their value, some of the most notable will be briefly indicated. Day's *Science of Æsthetics* (New Haven: 1872) is designed for a text-book, and hence deals mainly in formal definitions and classifications. Samson's *Elements of Art Criticism* (52), which aims at great comprehensiveness, does little more than bring into juxtaposition unrelated details. Harris's *Theory of the Arts* (18) is largely composed of commonplaces grouped about a theory of no great worth or co-ordinating power. McDermot's *Critical Dissertation* (19) is clear enough, but antiquated. The popularity enjoyed by Bascom's *Æsthetics* (16) has been deserved by the

lucidity and readableness of the text. The prominence given to the author's ethical and theological views may seem to some a trifle obtrusive. Van Dyke's *Principles of Art* (22) covers much ground, but is restricted by its small compass to a brief treatment of the separate topics. A useful primer of art is Lucy Crane's *Lectures on Art and the Formation of Taste* (22) adopted as a text-book by the managers of the Chautauqua Reading Circle.

Gaukler's *Le Beau* (44) is perhaps the simplest and handiest of the French compends. Veron aims to cover the whole field of speculation, but is exceedingly unsystematic. A good translation (38) is available.

In the German language, Lemecke's *Populäre Aesthetik* (29) is simple in style, and although condemned by Schasler as trivial and conventional, about the best thing of the kind to be obtained. Other German compends are Stöckel's *Allg. Lehrbuch d. Aesthetik* (3. Aufl. Mainz: 1889) and Prölss's *Katechismus d. Aesthetik* (2 Aufl. Leipz.: 1889).

II.

For the second class of students, those who desire to make themselves thoroughly at home

in the subject, the historical method is here, as in most branches, by far the best. A general notion of the scope of the science may be secured in the way suggested above, after which Greek æsthetics should be resolutely attacked. The theories of Socrates may be gathered from Xenophon's *Memorabilia* and *Banquet*. Of Plato's dialogues, the *Ion*, *Phaedo*, *Symposium*, *Gorgias*, and *Philebus* should be read entire, and at least books 2, 3, 7-10 of the *Republic*. Jowett's translation (13) is, of course, unrivalled, except in the case of the *Republic*, where it shares honors with that of Davies and Vaughan (14). Aristotle's *Poetics* should be studied, if possible, in the original. Of the translations, ✓ / Wharton's (11) is the only one that can be recom- / mended. The passages of the *Rhetoric*, *Metaphysics*, and *Psychology* (11) that throw light on Aristotle's theory of art, should not escape attention. The writings of Plotinus (14) and Longinus (13) are important for the history of æsthetics, but may be left for later investigation.

In taking up the German authorities, while it is desirable that some acquaintance should first be formed with the theories and results of Baumgarten (*Aesthetica*, Frankfurt a. d. Oder:

1750-58, Wincklemann (49), Lessing (29, 30): and Goethe (25, 26), the reading of these authors may, if time presses, be deferred until the more systematic treatises have been dealt with. Beginning with Kant, the principles of the *Kritik der Aesthetischen Urtheilskraft* should be thoroughly mastered, either by a reading of the text, or by a careful study of Caird's *Critical Philosophy of Kant* (28) v. 2, p. 420-476. Unfortunately, no English translation of the *Critique of Judgment* is in existence, though passages have been translated by Watson (28). Barni's free rendering (2v. Paris: 1846) is not generally available. The obscurity of the original has been much over-rated, in particular by Prof. Eaton in *New Eng.* 49:246. Schiller may be read in Weiss's translation (31). Especial attention should be directed to Schiller's indebtedness to Kant and to his advance upon the latter. Schelling's *Philosophie der Kunst* (31) must be read in the original if read at all. It is of considerable importance in the historical sequence. With Hegel's *Vorlesungen über die Aesthetik* the student should make himself thoroughly at home. Bosanquet's admirable translation (26) of the *Einleitung* and *Eintheilung* furnishes the key to the whole

work. Hastie (27) has translated p. 1-30 of the *Einleitung* and p. 105-114 of the *Eintheilung* (Bosanquet, p. vi., wrongly assumes p. 34-36 of Hastie's work to be an analysis), but his translation, while readable and fairly representative of Hegel's thought, falls far below Bosanquet's in point of critical value. The motto which Hastie has placed opposite his title-page is a curious example of the danger of fragmentary quotation.* Kedney's work (27) has value as being the only detailed exposition in English of the whole *Aesthetik*. Unhappily, the author has followed the plan of substituting his own theories for those of Hegel at every point wherein he differs with the latter, and the reader, though warned of the interpolated matter by the insertion of brackets, cannot be sure whether the impressions that he carries away from the work are those of the expositor or the expounded. The author's criticism, p. 16, of Hegel's position with regard to the beauty of nature is clearly based on a misreading of the *Aesthetik*. (See the *Einleitung*, p. 57-58). The same is probably true of the bracketed paragraph on p. 187-

*i. e., a view of art which Hegel ascribes to common opinion, is set down as Hegel's own view. The same error is committed by the author (G. H. Lewes?) of the article in *Brit. and For. Rev.* 13: 1 (p. 22).

188. Much translation, including Bénard's exposition, will be found in the *Jl. Spec. Philos.* (27). The reading of the entire *Aesthetik* is no very formidable task for those who are familiar with the Hegelian terminology, and that it will amply repay the labor, is a point that need not be argued. Schopenhauer (32) and Lotze (30) may be read in translation. Other German writers who may be consulted at discretion, are Ruge (*Neue Vorschule d. Aesth.* Halle: 1837), Schleiermacher (*Vorles. üb. Aesth.* Berlin: 1842), Solger (32), Richter (31), Weisse (*System d. Aesth. als Weissensch. v. d. Idee d. Schönen*, Leipz.: 1830), Vischer (32) whose monster treatise is a complete encyclopaedia of aesthetic theory, Krause (*Vorlesungen über Aesth.* (1828-29, and *Abriss d. Aesthet.* 1837), Zimmermann (33), Carriere (25), Schasler (31), Koestlin (29), Von Kirchmann (*Aesth. auf realistischer Grundl.*, Berlin: 1869), Horwicz (*Grundl. e. Systems d. Aesthetik*, Leipz.: 1869), and Siebeck (32). Trahdorff (*Aesthetik*, 2v. Berlin: 1830) has been revived by von Hartmann (*Philos. Monatshefte* 22: 59), but hardly seems entitled to the space allotted him by the latter in his *Æsthetik* (I. 129-156). Herbart's wide-reaching influence in psychology makes it

desirable to know something of his æsthetics, in which he includes his ethical theory. Zeising's name (33) is so identified with the 'golden section' that his other theories are generally neglected. Though his standpoint is Hegelian, his æsthetic is influenced by Herbart. The psychophysicist, Fechner, who has verified by elaborate experiment the discovery of Zeising, represents a revolt against the method of speculative æsthetics. The investigations of Helmholtz with reference to the physiology of sound (71) and of light (*Optique Physiologique*, Paris: 1867) are indispensable to the specialist. Wherever he has expanded his theories in systematic form, Helmholtz has followed the lines laid down by Kant in his *Critique of Judgment*. The most formidable, and at the same time one of the ablest, of late contributions to æsthetics is the systematic treatise of Von Hartmann (26). It is defective in that it gives little or no space to the historical aspect of art.

Among the French writers, P. André (*Traité sur le beau*, in *Oeuvres Philos.*, Paris: 1843), Buffier (*Sur la Nature du Goût*, in *Cours général et particulier des Sciences*, Paris: 1732), Batteux (108), and Diderot (36), in the last century, and Cousin (36), Jouffroy (37) Pictet

(Du Beau dans la Nature, Paris: 1856), Lévêque (37), Chaignet (Principes de la Science du Beau, Paris: 1860), Prudhomme (37), Taine (38), and Veron (38), in the present century, have the strongest claim to attention. Of the whole number the treatise of Lévêque is the most systematic. Chaignet is most interested in the psychology of æsthetics. The brilliancy of Taine's style and the glib simplicity of his system have made his theories better known in this country than those of any other foreign writer. His *caractère essentiel* should be compared with Herder's *Bedeutende*, Hirt's *Charakteristische*, and Goethe's *Bedeutende*.* (See Schasler's *Gesch. d. Æsth.* v. 1. p. 498-499, Hegel's *Æsth.* I. 23-26, Bosanquet's trans., p. 31-37).

Of late writers who have discussed special topics with ability, should be mentioned Bénard, Milsand, Guyau, Séailles, Lechalas, Souriau, Charles Henry, Arréat, Paulhan, and Sorel. All have been frequent contributors to the

* A curious anticipation of Taine's formula of the race, the moment, and the environment occurs in Hegel's *Æsth.* I. p. 20: Sodann gehört jedes Kunstwerk seiner Zeit, seinem Volke, seiner Umgebung an. Brunetière, who adds to the three conditions specified by Taine the element of individuality (*L'Evolution des Genres dans l'Histoire de la Litt.*, I. p. 22), seems also to have been anticipated by Hegel, *Æsth.* I. p. 45: Denn das

Rev. d. D. Mondes or the Rev. Philosophique. Bénard represents the Hegelian influence. Henry inclines to the mathematical interpretation of æsthetic facts. Sorel is a follower of Fechner. See the interesting article by the latter in Rev. Philos. 29:56, 30:22, on Psycho-physical Contributions to the Study of Æsthetics.

English æsthetics, because the science has not been recognized as a department of philosophy, is for the most part a matter of shreds and patches. The attitude of the British mind, up to a very late period, is perhaps best indicated by the brief note in the eighth edition of the Encyclopædia Britannica:—

“ÆSTHETICS.—A term . . . employed by the followers of the German metaphysicians to designate philosophical investigations into the theory of the Beautiful or Philosophy of the Fine Arts, which they are disposed to regard as a distinct science. . . . Æsthetic speculations do not appear to have contributed anything to the

Kunstwerk, um seiner zugleich materiellen und individuellen Natur willen, geht wesentlich aus besonderen Bedingungen der manichfachsten Art, wozu vorzüglich Zeit und Ort der Entstehung, dann die bestimmte Individualität des Künstlers und hauptsächlich die technische Ausbildung der Kunst gehören. hervor

improvement of the fine arts, or to our real knowledge of mental phenomena."

Bacon (15), Shaftesbury (21), Hutcheson (18), Reid (20), Hume (18), Stewart (22), Lord Kames (19), Burke (16), Alison (15), Jeffrey (19), and Sir Wm. Hamilton (17) are the most important of the earlier writers. Of the modern contributions, Spencer's chapter on the *Æsthetic Emotions* in his *Psychology* (22), an elaboration of Schiller's *Spieltrieb*, has had most influence on scientific thought, Ruskin's *Modern Painters* most influence upon the popular consciousness. Grant Allen, in his *Physiological Æsthetics* (15), has followed up the line of research outlined by Spencer's theory, and added much illustrative material.

It may be useful to those pursuing this line of historical study to mention some of the most important critical helps. Of the general histories of *æsthetics*, Schasler's *Kritische Geschichte* (10) should be noted first as at once the clearest and most comprehensive. Zimmermann's *Geschichte* (10) is valuable, but not so complete. Sully's article in the 9th edition of the *Encyclopædia Britannica*, though excellent for reference, does not pretend to be more than a sketch. Sully's evolutionist inclinations lead

him to minimize the results of German speculation. Both Ueberweg's and Erdmann's *Histories of Philosophy* give generous space to æsthetics. A short summary of æsthetic theories is given in Bain's *Mental Science* (15) and a fuller account in Lévêque's *Science du Beau* (37). Hermann's *Die Aesthetik in ihrer Geschichte und als wissenschaftliches System* (Leipz.: 1875) has not been consulted. A general history of æsthetics is now in preparation by Mr. Bernard Bosanquet for Muirhead's *Library of Philosophy*.

Of authorities on Greek æsthetics, Ed. Müller's *Geschichte der Theorie der Kunst bei den Alten* (Breslau: 1834) has as yet no rival. Egger's *Essai sur l'histoire de la Critique chez les Grecs* (9) is admirably clear, but is concerned rather more with rhetoric than with æsthetics proper. The first volume of Chaignet's *Histoire de la Psychologie des Grecs* (9) systematizes the implied psychology of Socrates and Plato. For his treatment of Aristotle, see his *Essai sur la Psychologie d'Aristote* (Paris: 1884). Zeller's summaries of Plato (14) and Aristotle (11) are searching, but have a rigidity peculiar to his mode of treatment—everything seems to shrink a little under Zeller's touch. The article by

Nettleship in Abbot's *Hellenica* (13), though dealing solely with the Republic, contains a fairly adequate exposition of Plato's theory of art. Jowett's introductions to the Dialogues are too well known to require commendation. The exposition of Plato which forms the appendix to Veron's *Æsthetics* (38) is decidedly superficial. Monographs on Aristotle are so numerous that no complete list can be attempted here. Döring's *Die Kunstlehre des Aristoteles* (12) is one of the best. It contains a very complete bibliography. Teichmüller's *Aristotelische Forschungen* (12) may be recommended for carefulness and minuteness of research. A recent work is Bénard's *L'Esthétique d'Aristote et de ses Successeurs* (Paris: 1890) done with the author's customary thoroughness. Bénard is especially severe on those who practice what he calls *l'Art d'accoucher les grands esprits*, i. e., who read into Aristotle the results of later speculation.*

*Of the more important monographs not included in the 'Gulde,' may be mentioned: (1) *On Plato*: Ed. Müller, Ueber das Nachahmende in d. Kunst nach Plato (Ratibor: 1831), A. Ruge, Die Platonische Aesthetik (Halle: 1852), Ch. Lévêque, Platon, fondateur de l'esthétique (Paris: 1857), K. Justl, Die æsth. Elemente in d. Platon. Philos., (Marburg: 1860), Jos. Reber, Plato und die Poesie (München: 1864), M. Remy, Plat. doct. de Artibus liberalibus (Halle: 1864), A. H. Raabe, De Poetica

The standard history of German æsthetics is that of Lotze (11), of which an extended exposition may be found in Erdmann's History of Philosoph., Trans., III. p. 315-322. The German writers since Kant are treated with minuteness by Von Hartmann (10). Neudecker's Studien zur Geschichte der deutschen Aesthetik seit Kant (Wurz: 1878) is valuable, though much condensed. A brief review of German æsthetics will be found in Von Eye's Das Reich des Schönen (25), p. 38. For the lines of development leading up to Kant, see Fenner's Die Aesthetik Kants und seiner Vorgänger (28). The value of Caird's exposition of the Critique of Judgment has been already set forth. The portion of Hegel's Aesthetik in which the author points out the reawakening of the science of art that accompanied the reawakening of German

Plat. (Rotterdam: 1866), C. Von Jan. Die Tonarten bei Plato (in Nene Jahrb. f. Philol. u. Paed., 95:815). (2) *On Aristotle*: W. Schrader, De artis apud Arist. notione ac vi (Berlin: 1843, München: 1881), L. Spengel. Ueber Kátharsis tôn pathemátôn bei Arist. (München: 1859), Martin, Analyse critique de la Poétique d'Aristote (Paris: 1836), Von Wartenburg, Die Katharsis des Arist. u. d. Oedipus Colonus d. Sophokles (Berlin: 1866), Stahr, Aristoteles u. d. Wirkung d. Trag. (Berlin: 1859), Rein-kens, Arist. üb. d. Kunst, besonders üb. d. Trag. (Wien: 1870), A. Dehlen. Die Theorie d. Arist. u. d. Tragödie d. Antiken Christl. Naturwissenschaftl. Weltanschauung (Göttingen: 1885). E. Jerusalem. Ueber d. Arist. Einheiten im Drama (Leipz.:

philosophy in general (*Æsth.* I, p. 72-88; Bosanquet's translation, p. 107-132), contains critiques of great interest on Kant, Schiller, Lessing, Winckelmann, Goethe, the Schlegels, Fichte, Solger, and Tieck. Of especial value for students of philosophy, is Mr. Bernard Bosanquet's masterly paper on *The Part Played by Aesthetic in the Development of Modern Philosophy*, published in the *Proceedings of the Aristotelian Society*, v. 1, No. 2. For a criticism of some of the most recent German (and other) writers, the student may consult Th. Lipps's *Ästhetische Litteraturbericht in Philos. Monatshefte* 26:17, 169, 323.

Of monographs on Schiller, G. Zimmerman's *Versuch einer Schillerschen Ästhetik* (Berlin: 1889) is a careful specimen of research. On Schelling, chap. 7 of Watson's volume in the *Griggs Philosophical Classics* (31) may be prof-

1885). The two essays of J. Bernays which have played so important a part in the discussion of the Aristotelian theory of tragedy, *Grundzüge d. verlorenen Abhandlung d. Arist. üb. die Wirkung d. Trag.* (Breslau: 1857), and *Ergänzung zu Aristoteles Poetik* (Rhein. Mus. N. F. 8, p. 561-566), have been reprinted in one volume under the title *Zwei Abhandl. üb. d. Arist. Theorie d. Drama* (Berlin: 1880). See further Bernays's *Brief an L. Spengel üb. d. trag. Katharsis bei Arist.* (Rhein. Mus. N. F. 14:367, 488) and *Zur Arist. Katharsis-Frage* (Rhein. Mus. 15:606) and Spengel's zur "tragischen Katharsis" d. Arist. (Rhein. Mus. 15:458).

itably consulted. The limitations of Kedney's Exposition of Hegel are pointed out above. Some assistance may be derived from Hastie's somewhat over-enthusiastic introduction to his translation of Hegel and Michelet (27), and valuable suggestion's from Ritchie's review of Bosanquet's translation, *Mind* 12: 597. The leading article in v. 13 of the *British and Foreign Review* (by G. H. Lewes?) is one of the earliest attempts to introduce Hegel's *Æsthetics* to English readers.* Both Michelet (30) and Ulrici (*Princip u. Methode d. Hegelschen Philos.* Halle: 1841, p. 216-245), have expounded the *Æsthetik*, but the original will be found in most cases clearer, and (at any rate in the *Einleitung* and *Eintheilung*) briefer, than the exposition.

Schopenhauer's æsthetic doctrines are briefly touched upon by Helen Zimmern in *Arthur Schopenhauer: His Life and Philosophy* (32), and by Bowen in his *Modern Philosophy* (32), and developed at some length by H. Klee

* The article contains considerable translation, including a passage from Hegel's *Æsthetik* which has since been frequently quoted: "Metre is the first and only condition absolutely demanded by poetry, etc." See the article, "Poetry" by Th. Watts in *Encycl. Brit.* 9th Ed., and Gummere's *Poetics*. Introduction. That this quotation does not accurately represent Hegel's thought will be apparent from a reading of the *Æsthetik*, III. 220 et seq.

(Grundzüge einer Ästh. nach Schopenhauer, Berlin: 1875), and S. Stransky (Versuch d. Entw. e. allg. Ästh. auf Schopenhauerischer Grundl. Wien: 1886). E. Reich's Schopenhauer als Philosoph der Tragödie (Wien 1888) deals with an interesting feature of Schopenhauer's æsthetic. On Lotze see T. Kögel's Lotze's Ästhetik (Göttingen: 1886), and Röhr's Kritische Untersuchungen über Lotze's Ästhetik (Halle-Wittenberg: 1880). A detailed exposition of Fechner may be found in Erdmann's History of Philos., Trans., III., 296-298. ('Gilt edge,' p. 297, line 21, is evidently a slip on the part of the translator. *Goldner Schnitt* means, of course, in æsthetic terminology, 'golden section'.)

In Contemp. 1: 279, Prof. Dowden discusses French Æsthetics, dealing with Cousin, Jouffroy, Lamennais, and Lévêque. Jouffroy's importance is over-emphasized. An interesting article by Prof. Eaton on Modern French Æsthetics, containing notices of Lévêque, Chaignet and others, appeared in the New Englander, 49: 246. In the same line is an exhaustive review of Lévêque's *La Science du Beau*, from the pen of E. Saisset in the Rev. d. D. Mondes 15 Nov., 1861, reprinted in the latter's *L'Ame et la Vie*,

p. 91. On Taine see the two essays in vol. 4 of Scherer's *Etudes Critiques sur la Littérature*, p. 253-260, *La Methode de M. Taine*, p. 261-272, *M. Taine et la Philosophie de l'art grec*; and Prof. Morris's *Philosophy of Art*, *Jl. Spec. Philos.* 10: 1. For the place of the Cartesian philosophy in the history of æsthetics, the reader may consult Schasler's *Geschichte*, I. 280-283 and Krantz's *Essai sur l'esthétique de Descartes* (Paris; 1882).

A few suggestions for help in investigating special problems will perhaps be of service to the student who is specializing in this line of research.

The Beautiful. As every writer on æsthetics has something to say on this head, no general references need be given. Blackie's *On Beauty* (Edinb: 1858) is directed against the views of Alison. A great part of the work is taken up by an exposition of the Beautiful according to Plato. Prof. Blackie also contributed an article on the Philosophy of the Beautiful to the *Contemp.* 43:814. *Die Idee des Schönen in der Platonischen Philosophie* is the title of the first volume of Sträter's *Studien zur Geschichte der Aesthetik* (Bonn: 1861). On the Kantian conception of beauty, see Nicolai's *Ist der Begriff*

des Schönen bei Kant consequent Entwickelt? (Kiel: 1889), and Blencke's *Die Trennung d. Schönen vom Angenehmen in Kants Kr. d. Urtheilskraft* (Leipz: 1888). Byk's *Physiologie des Schönen* (Leipz: 1878) will be found useful to compare with Grant Allen's method of treatment of the same subject. Those who are interested in this phase of æsthetics should not overlook the paragraphs on the Acquisition of Beauty in Darwin's *Origin of Species* (paragraphs 302-4, 792), and on Ideas of Beauty, in *Descent of Man* (2d. ed., p. 92, 410-414, 540-541, 573-585, 595-596). A consideration of the Beautiful from a speculative point of view will be found in *Jl. Spec. Philos.* 17:94 in an article by W. H. Kimball. Köstlin's *Ueber d. Schönheitsbegriff* will repay perusal. For the psychological aspects of the question see Dimetresco's *Der Schönheitsbegriff* (42).

The Ugly. *Die Aesthetik des Hässlichen* by K. Rosenkranz (Königsberg: 1853) is the most comprehensive work on this subject. Von Hartmann reviews recent theories of the Ugly and devotes considerable space to it in his systematic æsthetics. See indexes to vols. 1 and 2 under *hässliche*. A brief account of German theories will be found in Lotze's *Geschichte*, p.

333-342. By far the ablest single article on the subject is Mr. Bernard Bosanquet's paper, The Aesthetic Theory of Ugliness, in Proceedings of the Aristotelian Society, No. 3, Part 1. Plotinus is generally named as the first to attempt an adequate analysis of the Ugly. Other authorities who have treated it at length are F. Schlegel, Solger, Weisse, Ruge, Von Kirchmann, Schasler, and Carriere.

The Sublime. A short list of those who have written upon the sublime, with a rapid sketch of the opinions of each, will be found in the supplement to Kedney's *The Beautiful and the Sublime* (N. Y.: 1880). Arthur Seidl's *Zur Geschichte des Erhabenheitsbegriffes seit Kant* considers with some fullness Kant and his predecessors (p. 1-15), and with exhaustiveness the writers with whom it is especially concerned. The list of books (p. vii-x) that the author has not been able to consult, is rather formidable. A summary of Seidl's conclusions will be found in the article by Prof. Everett in *Andover Review*, August, 1890, on the Philosophy of the Sublime. See also index to vol. 2 of Von Hartmann's *Aesthetik*, under *Erhabene*, and Lotze's *Geschichte*, p. 324-333. Hegel's chapter *Die Symbolik der Erhabenheit* (*Aesth.* I, p. 454)

has been translated by Stirling (Macm. 16:44 Symbolism of the Sublime). Cf. Hegel's Aesth. I. p. 427 et seq. The Origin of the Sublime is the title of an article by Grant Allen in Mind 3:324. See also the treatise by Blencke cited in the references on the Beautiful.

The Pathetic. The modern phases of the pathetic have not been fully investigated. Schiller's essay on Pathos deals mainly with the Greek conception. Von Hartmann gives but two pages to *Das Pathetische* (vol. 2, p. 313-314), but the entire chapter should be read; especially the paragraphs on *Das Ruhrende*, *Das Traurige*, *Das Elegische oder Wehmüthige*, etc.

The Comic. To the references given on p. 46 of the 'Guide' may be added the often discussed definition of laughter found in Hobbes's English works (Lond: 1839-45) Vol. 3, p. 45-47 (see also vol. 4, p. 46, 455), Spencer's Physiology of Laughter, Darwin's Expression of the Emotions (Lond: 1870), Hecker's Physiol. u. Psychol. des Lachens (42), L. Dumont's Des Causes de Rire (Paris: 1862), and Prof. Butcher's article on the Evolution of Humor, in Harper 80:898. A recent work is Masci's Psicologia del Comico (Naples: 1889). For a review of German theories see Lotze's Geschichte,

p. 342-352, Von Hartmann's *Aesthetik* I. index under *Anthropologischer*.

A rather full bibliography of the subject will be found in Regnard's *Oeuvres Complètes* (Paris: 1860).

In conclusion, it may be useful to call attention to the most important sources of information on the physiological, psycho-physical, and psychological aspects of Aesthetics.

Physiological and psycho-physical. Notable contributions in this field have been made by Burke (16), Spencer (22), Allen (15), Zeising (33), Fechner (25), Helmholtz (71 and *Optique Physiologique*), Wundt (33), and Ladd (42). An interesting article by Sorel on Psycho-physical contributions to the Study of Aesthetics will be found in *Rev. Philos.* 29:561; 30:22.

Psychological. In addition to those given in the list on p. 42-43 of the 'Guide,' may be mentioned: Bain (15, 16), Murray, *Handbook of Psychology*, p. 223-235, 387-390, Lazarus, *Das Leben d. Seele* (2 v. Berlin: 1875-78), C. Hermann, *Aesthet. Farbenlehre* (Leipz: 1876). Though the subject of æsthetic is purposely excluded from James's *Psychology* (N. Y: 1890), his chapters on Imagination and Feeling can not fail to be richly suggestive.

OCT 31 1892



University of Michigan
Extension Teaching

Syllabus and References

THE INTERPRETATION OF ART

With special reference to LEONARDO DA VINCI and MICHAEL ANGELO

SEMINARY

Conducted by FRED N. SCOTT, PH. D., Assistant Professor of Rhetoric

PREFATORY NOTE FOR MEMBERS OF THE CLASS

The term Seminary implies that the main purpose of the course is original investigation. The lectures are intended merely to furnish the tools; the work, if it is done at all, must be done by the individual student out of his own mental resources. The idea that great erudition is necessary to independent research in art is believed to be erroneous. Every student who uses what knowledge he already has, in interpreting the results of his own observations, is in so far making original research; further, he is making it in the only way in which such research is ever made. The Reports, therefore, for which suggestions are offered, are intended to record the personal observations of the student (1) upon particular works of art, where these are accessible, (2) upon points made in the lecture, or (3) upon material which he may find in the reference-books.

The object of the Reports will be defeated unless a spirit of independence, a determination not to accept

conventional opinions simply because they are found in books, is resolutely maintained. In art more almost than in any other subject that can be named, the incubus of authority terrorizes genuine appreciation.

The Reports are of two kinds: (1) a main report, on which work is done at pleasure throughout the continuance of the course and which may take the place of a final examination; (2) weekly reports on some one or more of the suggested questions. Outlines for the final report, and special references, will be furnished on application.

The References in the Bibliography are given, generally, in the order of their importance. It has been thought best to cite a large number of works under each head in order that all the resources of public and private libraries may be made available to the class: and so to distinguish the merits of each, by brief criticisms, that the student may be able to economize time in the selection of reading-matter. A few references have been made to works in foreign languages.

The following are recommended for purchase: Knight's *Philosophy of the Beautiful* (Scribner's Sons, N. Y.: 1891); Bosanquet's translation of Hegel's *Introduction to the Philosophy of Fine Art* (Kegan Paul, Lond.: 1886); Richter's *Leonardo da Vinci* and Clement's *Michael Angelo* (Great Artists Series); Schaff's *Renaissance* (Putnam, N. Y.: 1891).

The lectures will be illustrated by stereopticon views, or by miniature photographs distributed among the audience.

OUTLINE OF LECTURES

- I PRINCIPLES OF INTERPRETATION
 - 1 Meaning of aesthetics Scope and nature of the science Unsettled problems
 - 2 Brief sketch of the development of modern aesthetic theory
 - 3 The nature of art Its function in the life of the individual and the state The standard of aesthetic value
 - 4 The several arts and the stages of their development The art of the 19th century
 - 5 Place of painting among the arts
 - 6 The interpretation of pictures
- II ART AND THE RENAISSANCE
 - 1 The middle ages Divorce of brain and hand The mediaeval hypnotism
 - 2 The awakening Discovery of man and the state Phases of the movement
 - 3 Reasons for the artistic aspect of the Renaissance The demand for expression
 - 4 The special function of painting in the Renaissance
 - 5 Rapid sketch of painting from Cimabue to Leonardo
- III LEONARDO DA VINCI—The first and second periods of his life
 - 1 Early life and training
 - 2 Influences of the time; in society, politics and religion
 - 3 Personal character of the man
 - 4 Early paintings
 - 5 The Last Supper
- IV LEONARDO DA VINCI—Third period of his life
 - 1 Events of this period



- 2 Paintings and drawings
 - 3 The Mona Lisa
 - 4 Leonardo as scientist
 - 5 His contribution to art
 - 6 Leonardo's place in the movement of the Renaissance
- V MICHAEL ANGELO—Life and minor works
- 1 Early life and training
 - 2 Influences—relations with Lorenzo—with the Popes—with Savonarola—with Vittoria Colonna—with Leonardo and Raphael
 - 3 Michael Angelo as engineer
 - 4 As sculptor and architect
 - 5 As poet
 - 6 As painter—characteristics
- VI THE SISTINE FRESCOES
- 1 Plan of the whole
 - 2 Interpretation of the ceiling—the compartments
 - 3 The Sibyls
 - 4 The Prophets
 - 5 Interpretation of the Last Judgment
 - 6 What Michael Angelo did for the Renaissance and the 19th century

SUBJECTS FOR THE FINAL REPORT

A INTERPRETATION OF PICTURES

- 1 A detailed interpretation of (a) Michael Angelo's Creation of Man, or (b) of the Delphic, Persian, and Cumæan Sibyls, or (c) any three of the Prophets
- 2 Detailed description of ceiling of Sistine chapel, accounting for the arrangement of all the figures (Dappa's Life of Michael Angelo, Plate 3; Lübke's Hist. of Art, Vol. 2, p. 304; Woltmann and Woermann's Hist. of Painting, Vol. 2, page 491)
- 3 Comparison of Leonardo's Last Supper with representations of the same scene by other Italian artists (Mrs. Jameson's Sacred and Legendary Art, and History of our Lord)
- 4 Motives of the Sistine frescoes compared with those of illustrations in American magazines
- 5 Realism and Idealism in Italian Art (For the meaning of these terms, see Everett's Poet^y, Comedy, and Duty, p. 88-97; Fortnightly 48:418; Scribner's Mag. N. S., 2:241)

B THEORY OF ART

- 1 Aesthetic ideas of children in the public schools (The data to be obtained by observation. A list of questions will be furnished)
- 2 Aesthetic environment of the American citizen, from personal observation
- 3 The art-instinct in municipal or state politics (Data to be gathered from personal observation and from newspapers)
- 4 The political "machine" as a work of art

- 5 The art-impulse as manifested in American trade, industries, or business
- 6 Methods of distribution of American art
- 7 Ethical effect of the average aesthetic environment in American cities
- 8 Influence of the railroad on aesthetic appreciation in America
- 9 Difference between economic and aesthetic value
- 10 Difference between fine and useful art, using the works of Leonardo or Michael Angelo as examples of the one, and the telephone as an example of the other
- 11 Difference between Taine's theory of criticism as set forth in his *Philosophy of Art*, and his practice in the criticism of painting in his Italy, Naples, and Rome, and Italy, Florence, and Venice
- 12 Hegel's use of the terms classic and romantic art compared with the usage of other authorities (Bosanquet's translation, p 148-157; *Jl. Spec. Philos.*, Vols. 12-13; No. *Am. Rev.* 84:385; *Atlan. Mo.* 57:309; Schlegel's *Hist. of Literature*; James's *Psychology II*, p. 468-72)
- 13 The art-impulse according to Schiller and Spencer (See Schiller's *Aesthetic Letters*, and Spencer's *Psychology*, chapter on the aesthetic sentiments)

C ITALIAN ARTISTS

- 1 Religious (or irreligious) character of Italian painters as exhibited in Vasari's *Lives*
- 2 Comparison of Leonardo and Goethe
- 3 Leonardo's theory of painting, as exhibited in his *Treatise*, compared with Ruskin's
- 4 Michael Angelo and Savonarola
- 5 A study of Michael Angelo's Sonnets as an index of his life and character
- 6 Trace the steps by which Michael Angelo passed from the conception of the *Pietà* (St. Peter's) to the representation of the same personages in the *Last Judgment*

SUGGESTIONS FOR WEEKLY REPORTS

FIRST WEEK

- 1 How have you been accustomed to tell a good picture from a bad one?
- 2 What benefit do you get from examining works of art?
- 3 Do the old masters give you any great satisfaction? and if so, of what kind?
- 4 Do you ever tire of famous paintings or reproductions of them hung where you can see them daily? What pictures have thus affected you?
- 5 Does the inspection of art make you any better natured, more hopeful, more attentive to business, better satisfied with the humdrum of life—or the reverse?
- 6 Selecting any one of the pictures by Leonardo or Michael Angelo, tell what you like, or dislike in it, and give your reasons
- 7 Selecting one of the pictures that you have neither seen, nor read about, describe it minutely and give your own opinion as to its meaning
- 8 Selecting any picture by Michael Angelo, point out what elements you consider as beautiful and what, though not beautiful, you find attractive and interesting
- 9 What is the most characteristic specimen of American art you remember to have seen, and what do you regard as its distinctively American feature?

SECOND WEEK

- 1 Indicate the main currents in the Renaissance movement

- 2 Who were the prime movers, and what, in brief, are they supposed to have contributed to the movement?
- 3 What advance was made in thought—in views of man and his relations to society, God and nature—during this period?
- 4 What was the service of painting to the Renaissance?
- 5 Why should painting rather than sculpture, architecture, or music be the characteristic art of the Renaissance?
- 6 What office did painting fulfil that literature could not have fulfilled as well?
- 7 If painting did its perfect work at that time, of what use are the Old Masters to us of to-day?
- 8 Compare two pictures, one from the early and one from the late Renaissance, pointing out the significance of the differences between them.

THIRD WEEK

- 1 Personal character of Leonardo
- 2 His character read from his picture of himself
- 3 Influences political, religious, etc., during his early life
- 4 How do you explain his indolence and his scientific bent?
- 5 Biblical and other authorities for the characterization of the figures in the Last Supper
- 6 Does Goethe seem to you to be at fault in any particular in his interpretation?
- 7 Original and borrowed ideas in the Last Supper
- 8 Are any elements of the picture displeasing to you?
- 9 What has Leonardo's Last Supper to say to us of to-day in this country?

FOURTH WEEK

- 1 What is the value of Leonardo's contribution to science?

- 2 What was his contribution to the movement of intelligence in the Renaissance?
- 3 Common characteristics of Leonardo's various paintings and designs
- 4 Is your enjoyment of Leonardo's work affected by your study of it? If so, in what way?
- 5 Do you find the Mona Lisa disappointing? In what particulars?
- 6 Describe the features of the Mona Lisa in detail, giving the expression of each, and the combined effect
- 7 Do you regard anything about the picture as "indescribable?" If you mean that no one will ever be able to describe it, on what grounds do you assert such impossibility?
- 8 In what way is the world better (or worse) off for the existence of this painting?

FIFTH WEEK

- 1 Account for Michael Angelo's preference for sculpture
- 2 Meaning of his "terribleness"
- 3 Point out the "terrible" features in one of Michael Angelo's pictures
- 4 What political, religious, or philosophical problems did Michael Angelo help to solve?
- 5 Michael Angelo's relations with Savonarola
- 6 Passages from the Sonnets that throw light on his character and motives
- 7 Can you conceive how the "Moses" would have appeared had he been compelled to make a painting of it?
- 8 Did Michael Angelo express anything in painting which he could not have expressed as well in sculpture?

SIXTH WEEK

- 1 Borrowed and original ideas in the ceiling of the Sistine
- 2 What is the central idea of the whole design?

- 3 Interpretation of the Creation of the Sun and Moon, or of one of the Sibyls or Prophets
- 4 Conventional elements in the frescoes
- 5 Biblical or other authorities for any one of the scenes or figures of the ceiling
- 6 Sources for the motives of the Sibyls
- 7 Interpretation of the faces and attitudes of Christ and the Virgin in the Last Judgment
- 8 Identification of the Martyrs, or of the Old and New Testament characters?
- 9 Religious belief embodied in the Last Judgment
- 10 Of what value are the frescoes in the Sistine chapel to modern citizens of the United States?

BIBLIOGRAPHY

LITERATURE OF AESTHETICS.—A Guide to the Literature of Aesthetics, a classified bibliography by C. M. Gayley and F. N. Scott, is obtainable at a nominal price from Librarian Univ. of California, Berkeley. Aesthetics, its Problems and Literature, by F. N. Scott (Inland Press, Ann Arbor), gives classification of problems, courses of reading, and critical comments. The bibliography of Knight's *Philosophy of the Beautiful* is extensive.

GENERAL THEORY OF ART.—Knight's *Philosophy of the Beautiful*, though consisting of detached summaries in which little attempt is made to show the movement of thought, is the simplest introduction to aesthetic theory. The best single treatise for the serious student is Bosanquet's *Translation of Hegel's Introduction to the Philosophy of Fine Art*. Everett's *Poetry, Comedy, and Duty*, excellent for beginners, treats mainly of poetry; his *Science of Thought* contains chapters on the general theory. Sully's article 'Aesthetics' in the *Encycl. Brit.*, is valuable for its statement of problems (pub. in Humboldt Libr., 15c); the articles on 'Art' and 'Fine Art' by Colvin are easy reading, but do not go much below the surface. Van Dyke's *Principles of Art* is a useful little book, but opinionated. A clear presentation of fundamentals will be found in Prof. Seeley's article *Elementary Principles of Art*, *Macmillan's Mag.* 16:1, and in Hamerton's *Portfolio Papers*, p. 163-246 and p. 249-267. For those in search of simple and convenient critical tests, the line of thought developed by G. H. Lewes in his *Principles of Success in Literature* (Boston: 1891) will be found especially helpful.

The references given above are for the general reader. Those who care to go more deeply into the subject should pursue it as a branch of the history of philosophy. For outline of such a course see *Aesthetics, its Problems and Literature* referred to above. The mastery of modern aesthetics lies through a study of two main lines of thought: (1) German speculation, including Winckelmann, Kant, Schiller, Goethe, and Hegel; (2) evolutionist speculation, represented principally by Taine, Spencer, Allen, Bain and Sully.

Much of Hegel's monumental *Aesthetik* is now available in English. Besides Bosanquet's translation, which furnishes the key to the whole work, may be mentioned Kedney's *Exposition* in Griggs' *Philos. Classics* (in which Hegel is, however, sadly Kedneyized), and the translations in the *Jl. Spec. Philos.*, Vols. 1-3, 5-7, 11-12. Short papers from the Hegelian point of view, are Ker's *Philosophy of Art* in Seth and Haldane's *Philosophical Essays*; Morris's *Philosophy of Art*, *Jl. Spec. Philos.* 10:1; and W. T. Harris's *Art and Religion*, *Jl. Spec. Philos.* 10:204. A popular exposition of Hegel's theory of the development of the arts may be found in Vernon Lee's article *Comparative Aesthetics*, *Contemp. Rev.* 38:300.

Turning to the other side, Taine's theories are set forth in his *Ideal in Art* and *Philosophy of Art*, Spencer's in the last chapter of his *Psychology*. Grant Allen's *Physiological Aesthetics* is an expansion of Spencer's theory. Sully, in his *Sensation and Intuition*, Essay 13, sketches the science from the evolutionist point of view. The course of modern aesthetic theory is best outlined in Bosanquet's papers in the *Proceedings of the Aristotelian Society*. These will be incorporated in the author's *History of Aesthetic*, which promises to be the standard English work on this subject.

Ruskin deserves a paragraph to himself. His wayward theorizings on aesthetics become intelligible only when interpreted as part of the whole movement of thought. The general reader, will do well, therefore, to pass them by, accepting gratefully Ruskin's remarkable transcripts of his own observations in nature and art.

PAINTING.—On the relation of the fine arts to one another, nothing in English is so good as the papers in the *Proceedings of the Aristotelian Society*. Treatises on technique are legion. The simplest are W. B. Scott's *Half-hour Lectures on the History and Practice of the Fine and Ornamental Arts*, Lects. 14-15; Hamerton's *Graphic Arts*, chap. 20-21; the articles on 'Fresco' and 'Painting' in *Encycl. Brit.*, 9th Ed. On the introduction of oil painting into Italy, see the note, p. 214, in Eastlake's *materials for a History of Oil Painting*. Van Dyke's *How to Judge of a Picture* is an excellent brief exposition of such terms as perspective, value, tone, etc. See also Lucy Crane's *Art and the Formation of Taste*, Lect. 6; and Veron's *Aesthetics*, chapter on Painting.

THE RENAISSANCE.—Schaff's small volume, though a mere collection of sketches, makes an excellent hand-book. The bibliography is valuable. The best

short article is Symonds' 'Renaissance' in the *Encycl. Brit.* Symonds' *Renaissance in Italy*, seven large volumes full of florid rhetoric, is the standard English work. It is crowded with information and readable as a novel. A topical arrangement (in which art as such finds no place) is followed in Burckhardt's *Civilization of the Renaissance*, a thoroughly trustworthy work and one displaying immense research. The *Revival of Letters in the Fourteenth and Fifteenth Centuries* is the title of a series of semi-popular papers by Ex.-Pres. T. D. Woolsey in *New Eng.* 23:661; 24:35, 414, 605. Michelet's *Renaissance*, the 7th vol. of his *Hist. of France*, is brilliant and suggestive. For bibliography of special features see beginning of Schaff's chapters.

RENAISSANCE ART.—Standard works are Lübke's *History of Art*, vol. 2; Woltmann and Woermann's *History of Painting*, vol. 2; Eastlake's (Kugler's) *Handbook of Painting*, *The Italian Schools* (5th ed. rev. by Layard); Symonds' *Renaissance. The Fine Arts*. Middleton's article 'Schools of Painting' in *Encycl. Brit.* has an extensive bibliography. A popular and well illustrated work is Leader Scott's *Renaissance of Art in Italy*. Pater's *Studies in the History of the Renaissance* (reviewed by Morley, *Fortn.* 19:469, by Stillman, *Nation* 17:243) consists of detached essays in which the 'flavor' of the period is conveyed by subtle suggestion and emotional description. The same method is employed in Vernon Lee's *Euphronion*. A suggestive review by Hamerton of Müntz's *Renaissance* was published in the *Portfolio* 21:57. For original investigators, such works as Vasari's *Lives of the Painters*; Mrs. Jameson's *Memoirs of Early Italian Painters*, *Legends of the Monastic Orders*, *Legends of the Madonna*, *Sacred and Legendary Art*, and *History of our Lord* (Compl. by Lady Eastlake); Lanzi's *History of Painting in Italy*; and Crowe and Cavalcaselle's *Histories of Painting in Italy and in North Italy*; are reservoirs of detailed information. Of a more popular character are Burckhardt's *Cicerone* (eminently trustworthy); Middlemore's *The Great Age of Italian Painting*; Poynter and Head's *Italian Painting* (in *Art Educa. Ser.*). In *Italian masters in German Galleries*, G. Morelli illustrates the "experimental method" of criticism, identifying each painter by his manner of expressing details of the human form. Readers of German will find in Rümohr's *Italienische Forschungen und Drei Reisen* the foundation of later research.

LEONARDO.—The best small work is Richter's *Leonardo* in the *Great Artists series*; the best single article that of Colvin, *Encycl. Brit.* (see bibliography at close).

Mrs. Sweetser's small volume in Artist Biographies, based on Houssaye's work, has no illustrations. Mrs. Heaton's handsome volume is of value chiefly for its photographs, which include many designs as well as the chief works. Brown's Life of Leonardo, somewhat dull, is prefixed to Rigaud's Trans. of Leonardo's Treatise on Painting. A good short biography is Stillman's article in *Century* for April, 1891, with Cole's perfect engravings of the Mona Lisa, the Goldsmith, and the Adoration; the criticisms are superficial. See also *Century* for May, 1890, p. 94, for Cole's engraving of the angels, and comments, p. 99-101. Pater's essay in his *Studies in the History of the Renaissance*, with its remarkable characterization of the Mona Lisa, has become classic. (See Wilde's curious remark in 19th *Century* 28:144).

Vasari's *Lives of the Painters* is still the great storehouse of biography, though Milanesi and others have shown many of his good stories to be merely *ben trovato*. Extended notices of Leonardo with estimates of his works, occur in Lübke's *Hist. of Art*, vol. 2, p. 280-290; Woltmann and Woermann's *Hist. of Painting*, vol. 2, p. 461-475; Lady Eastlake's *Five Great Painters*, p. 1-97 (reprinted from *Edinb. Rev.* for Jan., 1875); Eastlake's *Handbook of Italian Schools*, vol. 2, p. 347-370; Morelli's *Italian Masters in German Galleries*; D'Anvers' *Elementary History of Art*, p. 356-361; Symonds' *Renaissance, The Fine Arts*, p. 313-327; Viardot's *Illustr. Hist. of Painters*, p. 88-94; Lanzi's *Hist. of Painting*, vol. 1, p. 147-162; Champlin's *Cyclopædia of Painters*; Clement's Michael Angelo, Leonardo, and Raphael (excellent in arrangement, but critically weak); Clara E. Clement's *Handbook of Painters*, p. 605-612. For references to Leonardo in Taine's *Italy, Florence, and Venice*, see index under 'Vinci'. The brief but valuable criticisms and comparisons in Crowe and Cavalcaselle are indexed under 'Leonardo' (see in particular the description of the angels in Verrocchio's Baptism of Christ, *Hist. of Painting in Italy*, Vol 2, p. 406-9).

Those who read German may be referred to the readable life and philosophical criticisms in Carriere's *Die Kunst in Zusammenhang d. Culturentwicklung*, Bd. 4, p. 120-135, the trustworthy article by Brun in Dohme's *Kunst u. Künstler*, Bd. 3, No. 61, and Richter's *Leonardo-Studien*, *Zeitsch. f. Bild. Kunst*, 1880-81. Readers of French will find an entertaining essay by G. Planche in *Rev. d. deux Mondes* 1 Sept. 1850, and another by Clement (afterwards incorporated in his book) in the same magazine 1 Avril 1860.

Articles of a general character will be found in Scribner 17:337; Ed. Rev. 141:39; For Quart. 15:209; Westminster 53:285; Lond. Quart. 45:323; Blackwood 42:270 (a comparison of Leonardo and Correggio); Meth. Quart. 21:557.

On Leonardo as scientist, see his own Treatise on Painting (transl. in Bohn Library); The essay on the Scientific and Literary works of Leonardo by C. C. Black in Mrs. Heaton's Leonardo; Bennett's paper on Leonardo as a Botanist, Nature 2:42; Dr. Knox's remarkable statement regarding Leonardo's knowledge of anatomy, Art Journal for 1852, p. 45; Hallam's Literature of Europe, Vol. 1, p. 303-4 (especially the footnote); and Richter's Literary Works of Leonardo.

Remarks on Leonardo's drawings will be found in Carr's Papers on Art, p. 4-48, and Wallis's Drawings from the Old Masters, Art J. for 1882, p. 33 (see also 34:316 for illustration). Many reproductions of sketches by Leonardo occur in Müntz's articles in L'Art for 1887-I, pp. 61, 154, 180; 1887-II, p. 65; 1889-I, p. 124; 1889-II, p. 1. (See also 1882-III, p. 1, 10).

THE LAST SUPPER.—Besides the descriptions in the treatises already cited, see Goethe's celebrated interpretation, translated in Jl. Spec. Philos. 1:243 (for the German original see Hempl. Ed. Bd. 28, p. 502; Cotta Ed., Bd. 31, p. 50; Cotta'sche Bibl. d. Weltlitt., Bd. 30, p. 151); Mrs. Jameson's Sacred and Legendary Art, Vol. 1, p. 261-277 (with picture of Last Suppers by Giotto, Leonardo and Raphael), and History of Our Lord, p. 19-23; Lloyd's somewhat sentimental paper in Portfolio 2:13; Saunder's Critical Description, in Brown's Life of Leonardo, p. 179-199; the article in The Fine Arts 5:204 with reproduction of the Venice study; the note by the Countess de Krockow in Am. Architect 25:145 on Stang's engraving; and the Chr. Examiner 40:411.

MICHAEL ANGELO.—Clement's Michael Angelo in the Great Artists Series is a good biography, but sentimental and exclamatory in its criticisms. The same remark applies to his larger work, Michael Angelo, Leonardo, Raphael. The engravings in the smaller book are fairly accurate (but compare the characterless face of the Delphic Sibyl, opp. p. 46, with the photograph or Cole's engraving). The best short article is Colvin's in the Encycl. Brit. (biblogr. at close). Stillman's article in Century for Nov. 1891 is too brief to be of much value, and the criticisms are very cheap goods. Cole's engravings of the Delphic and Cumaean Sibyls are, however, faultless. Mrs. Sweetzer's volume in Artist Biographies is short and concise. The stand-

ard work is Grimm's *Life* in two volumes, available in a poor translation. It is delightful reading and very comprehensive. (See review in *Nation* 1:533). The material for Wilson's compendious work is in part taken from the biography by Gotti. Black's *Michael Angelo* is valuable chiefly for its photographs, lists of works, and inclusive bibliography (at the close). The original *Life* by Duppa (repr. in *Bohn Libr.*) contains many engravings (some of them grotesquely unlike the originals), and *Michael Angelo's sonnets* in the Italian. Harford's *Life* (rev. in *Ed. Rev.* 106:507) contains much translation.

The following are some of the more valuable biographies and criticisms; Vasari's *Lives*, Vol. 5 (long and full of anecdote); Lübke's *Hist. of Art*, Vol. 2, p. 301-315; Woltmann and Woermann's *Hist. of Painting*, Vol. 2, p. 487-500; Symonds' *Renaissance, The Fine Arts*, p. 384-486; Lady Eastlake's *Five Great Painters*, p. 101-212 (rep. from *Ed. Rev.* for July 1876); Champplin's *Cyclopaedia of Painters*; Clara E. Clement's *Handbook of Painters*, p. 140-165; Perkins' *Raphael and Michael Angelo* (in alternate chapters); Eastlake's *Handbook of Painting*, Vol. 2, p. 370-389; D'Anvers' *Elementary Hist. of Art*, p. 362-368; Mrs. Oliphant's *Makers of Florence*, Chap. 15 (very readable); Viardot's *Illust. Hist. of Painters*, p. 105-112. See Cellini's *Autobiography* (Chap. 3 of the translation) for account of the quarrel with Torrigiano. Following are some of the noteworthy criticisms of a general character. The references to Michael Angelo in Mrs. Jameson's *History of Our Lord, Legends of the Madonna, Sacred and Legendary Art, and Legends of the Monastic Orders*, may be traced by consulting index under 'Angelo.' For Taine's always interesting impressions (in which he generally deserts his theories) see his *Italy, Naples, and Rome*, Bk. III, Chap. 9, and *Italy, Florence, and Venice*, index under 'Michael.' Ruskin has frequent references to Michael Angelo in his *Modern Painters*; see index. Of greater value is his paper on *The Relation between Michael Angelo and Tintoret* (Orpington: 1880). Further criticisms will be found in Jarves' *Art Studies*, Chap. 14; Owen's *Art Schools of Mediaeval Christendom*, Chaps. 13-14; Phelps' essay on *Plagiarisms of the Old Masters*, *Magazine of Art*, 1889, p. 257; and Poynter's *Ten Lectures on Art*, (dwelling esp. on M. A.'s realism). German readers will find able criticism in Carrière's *Die Kunst in Zusammenhang d. Culturentwicklung*, Bd. 4, p. 135-152, and Springer's article in *Dohme's Kunst u. Künstler*. An interesting biographical sketch by Blaze de Bury,

dealing with Michael Angelo's political relations, will be found in *Rev. d. deux Mondes* 1 Fevr. 1878. Among almost innumerable magazine articles, the most valuable are: *Galaxy* 19:198; *Blackwood*, 118:161; *Unitar. Rev.* 11:112; W. B. Scott's paper in *Portfolio* 658; Trollope's essay in *No. Am.* 125:199; *Quarterly Rev.* 103:136; and *Blackwood* 144:258 (a somewhat bombastic essay by W. W. Story, repr. in his *Excursions in Art and Letters*). The paper by Dr. Harris in *Jl. Spec. Philôs.* 11:265, on the Fates, is a model of interpretation. (Compare, on the Fates, Owen's *Art Schools*, chap. 14, and Tyrwhitt's *Christian Art and Symbolism*, Lect. 4.)

On Michael Angelo's poems, see *Ed. Rev.* 168:1, and the translations in the *Lives* by Harford and Duppa. Translations of the Sonnets will be found in Symonds' edition and in his *Renaissance, The Fine Arts*, p. 527. For the originals see Duppa's *Life*, p. 420, and Jordan's edition (Leipzig: 1875, with German trans. by Sophie Hasenclever).

With regard to Michael Angelo's drawings, see Robinson's *Critical Account* of the drawings in the Oxford Galleries; the book of Etchings, by Jos. Fisher, of the same drawings; the illustrated paper by Wallis in *Art J.* for 1882, p. 152; Fagan's *Art of Michael Angelo* (on Brit. Museum Collection); the fine reproductions in Ottley's *Italian School of Design*; the photographs and comments in Black's *Michael Angelo*, and the article by Müntz in *L'Art* 1889-I-11. An almost complete list of drawings is given in Braun's *Catalogue général des Photographies*.

THE CEILING OF THE SISTINE CHAPEL.—The best outline map of the ceiling is Plate 3, in Duppa's *Life*, (Lond.: 1807). Smaller representations will be found in Lübke's *Hist. of Art*, and Woltmann and Woermann's *Hist. of Painting*. A general view of the chapel follows p. 92 of Clement's *Michael Angelo*, forms the frontispiece to Viardot's *Illustr. Hist. of Painters*, and p. 105 of Manning's *Italian Pictures*. Descriptions of the ceiling are singularly fragmentary. The most comprehensive is that of Grimm, Vol. 1, p. 329-349. Others will be found in Duppa's *Life*; Perkins' *Raphael and Michael Angelo*; Lübke's *Hist. of Art*, Vol. 2, p. 304-308; Woltmann and Woermann's *Hist. of Painting*, Vol. 2, p. 490-496; Michelet's *Renaissance*, p. 401-2 (highly imaginative); Symonds' *Renaissance, the Fine Arts*, p. 407-412; Eastlake's *Handbook of Painting*, Vol. 2, p. 376-381, 387-389. Taine's vivid transcript of his emotions in the presence of the frescoes may be read in his *Italy, Naples, and Rome*,

Bk. III, Chap. 9. The references in Mrs. Jameson's works may be traced in the indexes under 'Sistine.' On the Sibyls and Prophets, see *History of Our Lord*, Vol. 1, p. 248-256. Quotations from Kugler, Mrs. Jameson, and others are given in *Hare's Walks in Rome*, p. 549. For a singular interpretation of the Creation of Man, see Wallis's article in *Art Jl.* 1882. ("Adam receives the breath of life from his maker with an attitude of sullen indifference.") Vasari's long description is rather fulsome. For Michael Angelo's methods of painting in fresco, see W. B. Scott's *Half-hour Lectures*, Lect. 14.

THE LAST JUDGMENT.—The best detailed interpretation is that by Dr. Harris in *Jl. Spec. Philos.* 3:73. The description in Grimm's *Life* covers pp. 206-222, in which see his suggestive comparison of the L. J. and the *Pieta*. Lady Eastlake's chapter in Mrs. Jameson's *Hist. of Our Lord*, Vol. 2, p. 392-416, on the L. J. in art, should be read with care, though little is said of Michael Angelo. Wilson's comments in his *Michael Angelo*, p. 419-435, are stimulating in their frankness. (He compares the face of Christ to that of Apollo, finds the features "without expression," the whole conception "a misrepresentation." The face of the Virgin is "without sentiment of any kind.") A briefer description is given in Black's *Michael Angelo*, accompanied by a photograph of Venusti's copy (compare Foster's *Etchings of Oxford drawings*). Further references are: Taine's *Italy, Naples, and Rome*, Bk. III, Chap. 9 (end); Duppa's *Life* (contains large outline engraving); Haydon's *Correspondence and Table Talk*, Vol. 2, p. 152; and Delacroix's *Le Jugement dernier* in *Revue d. deux Mondes*, 11 Août, 1837 (also reprinted). The general histories of art should of course be consulted.

POPULAR WORKS

LEONARDO AND MICHAEL ANGELO.—Cassels' *Lects. on Great Masters*, Lect. 1; Spooner's *Biogr. Hist. of the Fine Arts*; *Stories of the Italian Artists* (by the author of *Belt and Spur*), p. 130-149, 258-301; Mrs. Bolton's *Famous European Artists*, p. 66-66; *The Gallery of Portraits*, Vols. 1 and 4; *Historical Sketches of Old Painters*; Knox's *Great Artists*, p. 133-170, 171-186; Spooner's *Anecdotes of Painters*, Vol. 1; *Kunsthistorische Bilderbogen*, II Theil, plates 207-208 (same plates in Prang's *History of Art Series*).

MICHAEL ANGELO.—Buckley's *Dawnings of Genius*, p. 48-66; Foa's *Boy Artists*; Lester's *Artists, Merchants and Statesmen*, p. 26-73; Lord's *Beacon Lights of*

History, Vol. 3; Roscoe's Lives of Eminent Persons; Russel's Extraordinary Men; Princes of Art.

PHOTOGRAPHS

Trustworthy photographs can be best obtained by importing them. The prints made in this country are sometimes mere caricatures of the originals, sometimes reproductions of etchings or engravings which the dealers take no pains to identify. Standard European firms are the Fratelli Alinari, Via Nazionale, Florence; D. Anderson, 85 Piazza di Spagna, Rome; C. Naya, Place S. Marc n. 75, Venice; Sommer & Figlio, Naples (for views and statuary mainly); Neurdein Frères, 52 Avenue de Breteuil, Paris; Mansell & Co., 271 Oxford street, London, W.; the Autotype Co., 74 New Oxford street, London, W. C.; the Berlin Photograph Co., Berlin. The Carbon Photographs of Ad. Braun & Cie., 43 Avenue de l' Opéra, Paris, are fine, but expensive. Catalogues should be obtained, and studied, before ordering, and the size and price carefully determined. Braun's Catalogue général of 42,000 subjects, may be had for five francs. It is worth the price merely as a list of artists and works. Photos should always be ordered sent by mail unmounted. Any local photographer can mount them. Good effects may be obtained by mounting on a light buff card, with a margin of from two to four inches on each side.



ANN ARBOR, MICHIGAN:
THE REGISTER PUBLISHING COMPANY.
The Inland Press.
1892.

171

THIS BOOK IS DUE ON THE LAST DATE
STAMPED BELOW

AN INITIAL FINE OF 25 CENTS
WILL BE ASSESSED FOR FAILURE TO RETURN
THIS BOOK ON THE DATE DUE. THE PENALTY
WILL INCREASE TO 50 CENTS ON THE FOURTH
DAY AND TO \$1.00 ON THE SEVENTH DAY
OVERDUE.

JAN 24 1933

*San Diego
St. Coll*

JUL 8 1938

INTER-LIBRARY
LOAN

JUL 3 1939

JAN 31 1974

JUN 11 1948

27 Apr '49 BG

Due end of FALL Quarter
subject to recall after —

06124 4624

REC'D LD JUN 2 1972 9AM #4
AUTODISC CIRC #6 03 '94

APR 17 1972 09

REC'D LD FEB 20 '74 - 10 AM

SEP 10 1994

LD 21-50m-8, '32

U. C. BERKELEY LIBRARIES



C047852463

N6 G. 2.4
S36

44085

